



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,091	07/08/2003	Mark Davis	1070P3821	9656

53483 7590 12/07/2006

KACVINSKY LLC  
C/O INTELLEVATE  
P.O. BOX 52050  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

WONG, NOBLE S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2173

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/616,091	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DAVIS, MARK /	
	<b>Examiner</b> Noble S. Wong	<b>Art Unit</b> 2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/23/06 &amp; 3/28/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 15, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dyszel (Handspring Visor for Dummies).

As to claim 1, Dyszel teaches a method of displaying calendar information comprising:

- displaying a weekly view graphical image on a display screen (i.e. see Fig. 8-3, p. 121),
  - wherein said weekly view graphical image comprises days of the week and appointment icons therein (i.e. the columns represent the days of the week and bars in the columns represent appointment icons, see Fig. 8-3, p. 121);
- visually highlighting appointment icons in response to user navigation input (i.e. by tapping on the interface, see p. 122);
- in response to a user selection of a first highlighted appointment icon,
  - automatically displaying a preview window comprising details of said first highlighted appointment icon on said display screen (i.e. see top of Fig. 8-4, p. 122),
  - wherein said preview window is displayed simultaneously with said weekly view graphical image which remains user accessible while said preview window is open (i.e. see Fig. 8-4, p. 122).

As to claim 5, Dyszel teaches a method as described in Claim 1 wherein said user input is obtained from tactile interaction with a digitizer of said display screen (i.e. the screen supports tactile interaction by tapping, see p. 15).

As to claim 7, Dyszel teaches a method as described in Claim 1 further comprising, in response to a user navigation to a second highlighted appointment icon, automatically updating said preview window to display details of said second highlighted appointment icon on said

Art Unit: 2173

display screen (i.e. clicking on another bar will present information about the other bar, see p. 121).

As to claims 11, 15, and 17, claims 11, 15, and 17 differs from claim 1, 5, and 7 only in that claims 11, 15, and 17 are a system type claims with memory (see p. 208) and processor (see line 4, p. 13) on a bus where as claims 1, 5, and 7 are method claims. Thus, claims 11, 15, and 17 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 1, 5, and 7 above.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 22, 26, 28-30, 32, 36, and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dyszel (Handspring Visor for Dummies).

As to claim 22, Dyszel teaches a method of displaying calendar information comprising:

- displaying a monthly view graphical image on a display screen, wherein said monthly view graphical image comprises days of the month and appointment icons therein (see Fig. 8-5 with boxes in the day representing appointments in that day, p. 123);
- visually highlighting days in response to user navigation input (the 7<sup>th</sup> is highlighted, see Fig. 8-5, p. 123);

but does not teach

- in response to a user selection of a first highlighted day,
  - automatically displaying a preview window comprising details of appointments said first highlighted day on said display screen,
  - wherein said preview window is displayed simultaneously with said view graphical image which remains user accessible while said preview window is open.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Dyszel before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the weekly view graphical image with previews (see p. 121- 122) as taught by Dyszel to include using previews in a monthly view. The motivation to modify being to simultaneously preview a selected day in a calendar with a summary of appointments of that selected day (see p. 122 and 123).

As to claim 26, Dyszel teaches a method as described in Claim 22 wherein said user input is obtained from tactile interaction with a digitizer of a said display screen (i.e. the screen supports tactile interaction by tapping, see p. 15).

As to claim 28, Dyszel teaches a method as described in Claim 22 further comprising, in response to a user navigation to a second highlighted day, automatically updating said preview window to display details of appointments of said second highlighted day on said display screen (i.e. clicking on another bar will present information about the other bar, see p. 121).

As to claim 29, Dyszel teaches a method as described in Claim 22 further comprising displaying a full day view of said first highlighted day in response to a user selection provided said preview window is already open (i.e. tapping on a day in Month view will display the Day view for that day, see p. 123).

As to claim 30, Dyszel teaches a method as described in Claim 28 further comprising displaying a full day view of said second highlighted day in response to a user selection provided said preview window is already open (i.e. tapping on a day in Month view will display the Day view for that day, see p. 123).

As to claims 32, 36, 38, 39, and 40, claims 32, 36, 38, 39, and 40 differs from claim 22, 26, 28, 29 and 30 only in that claims 32, 36, 38, 39, and 40 are a system type claims with

Art Unit: 2173

memory (see p. 208, 'Dyszel) and processor (see line 4, p. 13, 'Dyszel) on a bus where as claims 22, 26, 28, 29 and 30 are method claims. Thus, claims 32, 36, 38, 39, and 40 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 22, 26, 28, 29 and 30 above.

5. Claims 2-4, 6, 12-14, 16, 23-25, 27, 33-35, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dyszel (Handspring Visor for Dummies) in view of Martin et al. (US Patent Application Publication # 2003/0122779 A1).

As to claim 2, Dyszel teaches a method as described in Claim 1 (see claim 1 above) but does not teach wherein said user navigation input is obtained from a 5-way navigation tool. Martin et al. teach wherein said user navigation input is obtained from a 5-way navigation tool (see [0083], 'Martin).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Dyszel and Martin et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the user navigational input as taught by Dyszel to include a 5-way navigational tool as taught by Martin et al. with the motivation being to provide "navigation within the various interfaces displayed on the PDA." (see [0083] lines 6-7, 'Martin)

As to claim 3, Dyszel in view of Martin et al. teach a method as described in Claim 2 wherein said user selection is obtained from said 5-way navigation tool (i.e. by clicking the center of the D-pad, see [0083], 'Martin).

As to claim 4, Dyszel in view of Martin et al. teach a method as described in Claim 3 wherein said 5-way navigation tool comprises a selection button and four cursor directional buttons (D-pad 105, see [0083], 'Martin).

As to claim 6, Dyszel teaches a method as described in Claim 1 (see claim 1 above) wherein said display screen is switchable between a small display mode which is substantially square in shape (i.e. Fig. 8-3 shows a square shape display, see p. 121, 'Dyszel), but does not teach a tall display mode which is substantially rectangular in shape. Martin et al. teach a tall display mode which is substantially rectangular in shape (i.e. display 102 Fig. 11 has a screen that is a tall rectangle, 'Martin).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Dyszel and Martin et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the display mode as taught by Dyszel to include a tall rectangular display mode as taught by Martin et al. with the motivation being to allow an application to be used in a plurality of screen sizes.

As to claims 12, 13, 14, and 16, claims 12, 13, 14, and 16 differs from claim 2, 3, 4, and 6 only in that claims 12, 13, 14, and 16 are a system type claims with memory (see p. 208, 'Dyszel) and processor (see line 4, p. 13, 'Dyszel) on a bus where as claims 2, 3, 4, and 6 are method claims. Thus, claims 12, 13, 14, and 16 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 2, 3, 4, and 6 above.

As to claim 23, Dyszel teaches a method as described in Claim 22 (see claim 22 above) but does not teach wherein said user navigation input is obtained from a 5-way navigation tool. Martin et al. teach wherein said user navigation input is obtained from a 5-way navigation tool (see [0083], 'Martin).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Dyszel and Martin et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify

Art Unit: 2173

the user navigational input as taught by Dyszel to include a 5-way navigational tool as taught by Martin et al. with the motivation being to provide “navigation within the various interfaces displayed on the PDA.” (see [0083] lines 6-7, ‘Martin)

As to claim 24, Dyszel in view of Martin et al. teach a method as described in Claim 2 wherein said user selection is obtained from said 5-way navigation tool (i.e. by clicking the center of the D-pad, see [0083], ‘Martin).

As to claim 25, Dyszel in view of Martin et al. teach a method as described in Claim 3 wherein said 5-way navigation tool comprises a selection button and four cursor directional buttons (D-pad 105, see [0083], ‘Martin).

As to claim 27, Dyszel teaches a method as described in Claim 22 (see claim 22 above) wherein said display screen is switchable between a small display mode which is substantially square in shape (i.e. Fig. 8-5 shows a square shape display, see p. 121, ‘Dyszel), but does not teach a tall display mode which is substantially rectangular in shape. Martin et al. teach a tall display mode which is substantially rectangular in shape (i.e. display 102 Fig. 11 has a screen that is a tall rectangle, ‘Martin).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Dyszel and Martin et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the display mode as taught by Dyszel to include a tall rectangular display mode as taught by Martin et al. with the motivation being to allow an application to be used in a plurality of screen sizes.

As to claims 33, 34, 35, and 37, claims 33, 34, 35, and 37 differs from claim 23, 24, 25, 27 only in that claims 33, 34, 35, and 37 are a system type claims with memory (see p. 208,



Art Unit: 2173

'Dyszel) and processor (see line 4, p. 13, 'Dyszel) on a bus where as claims 23, 24, 25, 27 are method claims. Thus, claims 33, 34, 35, and 37 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 23, 24, 25, 27 above.

6. Claims 8, 9, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dyszel (Handspring Visor for Dummies) in view of Kitamura et al. (US Patent # 6,947,158 B1).

As to claim 8, Dyszel teaches a method as described in Claim 1 (see claim 1 above) further comprising a removal of a preview window (i.e. in Fig. 8-3, since there is no selected block, there is no preview window, see p. 121, 'Dyszel) but does not teach further comprising removing said preview window in response to a user selection while said preview window is open. Kitamura et al. teach further comprising removing said preview window in response to a user selection while said preview window is open (i.e. see col. 4 lines 39-42, 'Kitamura).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Dyszel and Kitamura et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the removal of a preview window as taught by Dyszel to include the removal by user selection as taught by Kitamura with the motivation being to provide a way to close a preview window by a user selection.

As to claim 9, Dyszel teaches a method as described in Claim 7 further comprising a removal of a preview window (i.e. in Fig. 8-3, since there is no selected block, there is no preview window, see p. 121) but does not teach further comprising removing said preview window in response to a user selection while said preview window is open. Plumley teaches

Art Unit: 2173

further comprising removing said preview window in response to a user selection while said preview window is open (i.e. see col. 4 lines 39-42, 'Kitamura).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Dyszel and Kitamura et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the removal of a preview window as taught by Dyszel to include the removal by user selection as taught by Kitamura with the motivation being to provide a way to close a preview window by a user selection.

As to claims 18 and 19, claims 18 and 19 differs from claim 8 and 9 only in that claims 18 and 19 are a system type claims with memory (see p. 208, 'Dyszel) and processor (see line 4, p. 13, 'Dyszel) on a bus where as claims 8 and 9 are method claims. Thus, claims 18 and 19 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 8 and 9 above.

7. Claims 10, 20, 31, and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dyszel (Handspring Visor for Dummies) in view of Martin et al. (US Patent Application Publication # 2003/0122779 A1) and further in view of Microsoft (Microsoft Windows & MS-DOS 6 User's Guide).

As to claim 10, Dyszel in view of Martin et al. teach a method as described in Claim 4 (see claim 4 above) wherein said visually highlighting comprises: highlighting days of the week (i.e. see Fig. 8-4 where 9/10 is selected, 'Dyszel); and highlighting appointments within a highlighted day (i.e. by clicking on a block representing an appointment, see Fig. 8-4, 'Dyszel), but does not teach wherein the navigation is with left/right and up/down navigation. Microsoft teaches wherein the navigation is with left/right and up/down navigation (i.e. using cursor keys

Art Unit: 2173

to move the cursor to the item and to select an item using the cursor, see 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph and bottom of, p. 19, 'Microsoft).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Dyszel and Martin et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the visual highlighting and selection as taught by Dyszel to include a selection by left/right and up/down inputs as taught by Microsoft with the motivation being to select items using keys to navigate through an interface (see p. 19, 'Microsoft).

As to claim 20, claim 20 differs from claim 10 only in that claim 20 is a system type claim with memory (see p. 208, 'Dyszel) and processor (see line 4, p. 13, 'Dyszel) on a bus where as claim 10 is a method claim. Thus, claim 20 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 10 above.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Dyszel and Microsoft before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the display as taught by Dyszel to include a collapsible input area as taught by Microsoft with the motivation being to "enlarge an application to fill ... the entire desktop", see 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph p. 26, 'Microsoft).

As to claim 31, Dyszel in view of Martin et al. teach a method as described in Claim 25 (see claim 25 above) wherein said visually highlighting comprises: highlighting days of the month across a common row (i.e. see Fig. 8-5 where the 7<sup>th</sup> is selected, 'Dyszel); and highlighting days of the month across a common column within-a highlighted day (i.e. by clicking on a block representing an appointment, see Fig. 8-4, 'Dyszel), but does not teach wherein the navigation is with left/right and up/down navigation. Microsoft teaches wherein the

navigation is with left/right and up/down navigation (i.e. using cursor keys to move the cursor to the item and to select an item using the cursor, see 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph and bottom of, p. 19, 'Microsoft).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Dyszel and Martin et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the visual highlighting and selection as taught by Dyszel to include a selection by left/right and up/down inputs as taught by Microsoft with the motivation being to select items using keys to navigate through an interface (see p. 19, 'Microsoft).

As to claim 41, claim 41 differs from claim 31 only in that claim 41 is a system type claim with memory (see p. 208, 'Dyszel) and processor (see line 4, p. 13, 'Dyszel) on a bus where as claim 31 is a method claim. Thus, claim 41 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 31 above.

8. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dyszel (Handspring Visor for Dummies) in view of Microsoft (Microsoft Windows & MS-DOS 6 User's Guide).

As to claim 21, Dyszel teaches a computer system as described in Claim 11 (see claim 11 above) but does not teach wherein said display screen comprises a collapsible active input area for enlarging the effective area of said display screen. Microsoft teaches wherein said display screen comprises a collapsible active input area for enlarging the effective area of said display screen (i.e. by maximizing a window to the full length of the screen or restoring to the original size after it has been maximized, see p. 26, 'Microsoft).

***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach a calendar with previews of a certain day.

***Inquiries***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Noble S. Wong whose telephone number is (571) 270-1044. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NSW  
Noble Wong  
11/30/06

Kieu Vu  
Primary Examiner